



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/537,214	01/09/2006	Je-Ho Nam	51876P873	4679

8791 7590 10/16/2007
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, HAU H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2628

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/16/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/537,214

Applicant(s)

NAM ET AL.

Examiner

Hau H. Nguyen

Art Unit

2628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Charpentier (U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0001864).

As per claim 1, Charpentier teach an apparatus for adapting graphics contents to use a single source for multiple uses (server-client network as shown in Fig. 2), comprising:

a graphics usage environment information managing means (*controller 120*) for collecting, describing and managing graphics usage environment information from a user terminal (*remote computing device 56*) that consumes the graphics contents (page 3, par. 24-25); and

a graphics adapting means (*graphics customization mechanism 112*) for adapting the graphics contents to the graphics usage environment information of the user terminal and outputting the adapted graphics contents to the user terminal (i.e. *manipulating graphics content to produce graphics information in a second format that may vary according to the device type of the remote computing device 56*, page 4, par. 34),

wherein the graphics usage environment information includes user terminal characteristics information (*characteristic information of the remote computing device 56*, page

Art Unit: 2628

3, par. 25) and graphics presentation preference information (e.g. *to increase speed with which graphics contents is displayed on the remote computing device, or reducing color information, etc.*, page 4, par. 34).

As per claim 6, Charpentier teaches the graphics presentation preference information includes preference for geometrical characteristics of graphic objects of the graphics contents, and the graphics adapting means adapts the graphics contents by changing the geometric characteristics of the graphic objects of the graphics contents and transmits the adapted graphics contents to the user terminal (page 6, par. 47).

As per claim 7, Charpentier further teaches the graphics presentation preference information includes preference for material characteristics of the graphic objects of the graphics contents, and the graphics adapting means adapts the graphics contents by changing material characteristics of the graphic objects of the graphics contents and transmits the adapted graphics contents to the user terminal (i.e. changing patterns and gradient, page 5-6, par. 45).

Claim 9, which is similar in scope to claim 1, is thus rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 14, which is similar in scope to claim 6, is thus rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 15, which is similar in scope to claim 7, is thus rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charpentier (U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0001864).

As per claim 2, Charpentier fails to teach the user terminal characteristics information includes information related to encoding/decoding performance of the user terminal, and the graphics adapting means adapts the graphics contents based on the information related to encoding/decoding performance and transmits the adapted graphics contents to the user terminal. However, as cited above, Charpentier does suggest that all of the processing capabilities of the remote computing device are taken into consideration to generate the adapted graphics contents. Charpentier also teach reducing the transmission size of the generated graphics contents based on the information given by the remote computing device (pages 6-7, par. 55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to add the encoding/decoding performance information to the user terminal characteristic information (*characteristic information of the remote computing device 56*, as taught by Charpentier) so that the generated graphics contents are compressed before transmitting to the user terminal, and decompressed at the user terminal to reduce bandwidth in the communications link and to conform with the user terminal computing capabilities.

Claim 10, which is similar in scope to claim 2, is thus rejected under the same rationale.

5. Claims 3-5, 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charpentier (U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0001864) in view of McTernan et al. (U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2001/0047422) ("McTernan", hereinafter).

As per claim 3, as applied to claim 2 above, Charpentier teach all the limitations of claim 3, except that the encoding/decoding performance information includes information on the maximum number of vertices processed per second in the user terminal. However, McTernan teach a method for using benchmarking to account for variations in client capabilities in the distribution of a media presentation, wherein the computing capabilities of the client includes information on the maximum number of vertices processed per second in the user terminal (i.e. *the timing of graphics fill of a set of triangles is measured*, page 7, par. 80 and 82).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to utilize the method as taught by McTernan in combination with the method as taught by Charpentier to determiner the capabilities of three-dimensional processing of the user terminal device in order to adapt the graphics content thereof.

As per claim 4, Charpentier fails to teach the information related to encoding/decoding performance includes information on the maximum number of pixels shown in a screen buffer of the user terminal per second. However, McTernan teaches *measuring image resolution in pixels of the client computational resource. A Client selects the model that will produce the best show possible based upon its specific hardware and bandwidth constraints* (page 7, par. 80). Thus, the maximum number of pixels corresponding to the image resolution that a client display resource is capable of displaying is known and sent to the server. As is well known in the art, screen buffer is used to store frame of image ready to be displayed according to a certain frame rate, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to utilize the method of measuring screen buffer capacity as taught by McTernan in combination with the method as taught by Charpentier

Art Unit: 2628

so that graphics contents (such as image) can be formatted to fit the client's computational resource (in this case, to fit the screen buffer).

As per claim 5, although not explicitly taught by Charpentier, McTernan teaches the system allows clients to retrieve the resources most suitable for their capabilities, including processing power, graphics production speed, and bandwidth based on a benchmarker routine running on the client (page 3, par. 41). Thus, the bandwidth (maximum rate) between the graphics processor and the graphics memory is tested and measured by the benchmarker to let the server know the client's computational capabilities.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to utilize the method of measuring the memory bandwidth as taught by McTernan in combination with the method as taught by Charpentier so that graphics contents can be formatted to fit the client's computational resource (in this case, to fit the client's processing power and production speed as cited above).

Claims 11-13, which are similar in scope to claims 3-5, are thus rejected under the same rationale.

6. Claims 8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charpentier (U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0001864) in view Horvitz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,232,974). ("Horvitz", hereinafter).

As per claim 8, as cited above, Charpentier teach the server is adapted to produce graphics contents suitable to the client's computing capabilities based on the client's given information. Charpentier fails to teach the graphics presentation preference information includes user preference for the number of pictures of animation graphic objects shown for one second, and the graphics adapting means adapts the graphics contents by changing characteristics of the

Art Unit: 2628

animation graphic objects of the graphics contents based on the user preference and transmits the adapted graphics contents to the user terminal. However, Horvitz teaches a method for allocating computational resources of a computer or special purpose rendering device to maximize the perceived quality of multimedia content such as three-dimensional graphics, audio and video (col. 1, lines 8-15), wherein the graphics presentation preference information (i.e. *frame of animation to be adapted to the computational resource*) includes user preference for the number of pictures of objects shown for one second (*target frame rate*) (col. 9, lines 33-48).

Therefore, it would have been to one skilled in the art to utilize the method of allocating (limited) computing resources for producing animation as taught by Horvitz in combination with the method of adapting to the client computing resource as taught by Charpentier so that when the server provide graphics data for animation to the client, it can convert the graphics data to a format suitable to the client's computing capabilities.

Claim 16, which is similar in scope to claim 8, is thus rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hau H. Nguyen whose telephone number is: 571-272-7787. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-FRI from 8:30-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kee Tung can be reached on (571) 272-7794.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2628

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/H. Nguyen/

Hau Nguyen

AU 2628